

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 LONNIE LEE BANARK,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 JAMES DZURENDA, et al.,

11 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:16-CV-2555 JCM (GWF)

ORDER

12
13 Presently before the court is the matter of *Banark v. Dzurenda et al.*, case no. 2:16-cv-
14 02555-JCM-GWF. On December 20, 2018, the court granted defendants' motion for summary
15 judgment and dismissed plaintiff Lonnie Lee Banark's single remaining retaliation claim. (ECF
16 No. 59). Plaintiff has filed an objection to the court's decision to close case (ECF No. 61) and a
17 motion to reopen the case (ECF No. 64). Defendants Nathan Hughes and Holly Skulstad
18 responded to the objection (ECF No. 63) and notified the court that they considered the motion
19 to reopen the case to be a reply thereto (*see* ECF No. 65).

20 Ordinarily, "[t]he failure of a moving party to file points and authorities in support of the
21 motion constitutes a consent to the denial of the motion." LR 7-2(d). However, "the standard
22 practice of federal courts is to interpret filings by pro se litigants liberally and to afford greater
23 latitude as a matter of judicial discretion." *Ricotta v. California*, 4 F. Supp. 2d 961, 986 (S.D.
24 Cal. 1998). On the other hand, this court "lacks the power to act as a party's lawyer, even for pro
25 se litigants." *Bias v. Moynihan*, 508 F.3d 1212, 1219 (9th Cir. 2007).

26 Plaintiff provides no basis for the court to reconsider its order granting summary
27 judgment. (ECF No. 61). Plaintiff does not argue that he exhausted his administrative remedies,
28

1 that there has been an intervening change in law,¹ or that there is newly discovered evidence. *Id.*
2 The court—even when liberally construing plaintiff’s motion—is compelled to deny the motion.

3 Accordingly,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that plaintiff’s objection to
5 the court’s decision to close the case (ECF No. 61) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion to reopen case (ECF No. 64) be, and
7 the same hereby is, DENIED.

8 DATED December 3, 2019.

9 
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 ¹ Plaintiff mentions an appeal before the Ninth Circuit and a habeas corpus proceeding but does not explain in any way how those unrelated actions have any bearing on the instant case.